



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,168	12/31/2003	Yong-Suk Kim	Q77182	6948
23373 7590 05/21/2010				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
PAN, YUWEN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/21/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com  
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM  
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
2  
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
4

---

5  
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
7 AND INTERFERENCES  
8

---

9  
10 *Ex parte* YONG-SUK KIM, WON-YONG YOON,  
11 KYUN-HYON TCHAH, DOO-SEOP EOM,  
12 WON-HEE LEE, TAE-JIN LEE,  
13 and YANG-ICK JOO  
14

---

15  
16 Appeal 2009-011343  
17 Application 10/748,168  
18 Technology Center 2600  
19

---

20  
21 Oral Hearing Held: April 20, 2010  
22

---

23  
24 Before ROBERT E. NAPPI, ELENI MANTIS MERCADER, and  
25 BRADLEY W. BAUMEISTER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
26

27  
28 APPEARANCES:  
29

30  
31 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:  
32

33 FADI N. KIBLAWI, ESQUIRE  
34 Sughrue Mion, PLLC  
35 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
36 Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
37

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, April 20, 2010, commencing at 9:53 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Victoria L. Wilson, Notary Public.

THE USHER: Calendar number 55. Appeal number 2009-011343.

Mr. Kiblawi.

(Discussion off the record.)

JUDGE NAPPI: You have 20 minutes. You may begin when ready.

MR. KIBLAWI: Thank you very much.

JUDGE NAPPI: I'm not always sure if I'm right with the light so if it starts flashing and we don't seem to be indicating, just keep going.

MR. KIBLAWI: Thank you, your Honor.

And good morning, Your Honors. My name is Fadi Kiblawi. I'm representing the Appellant here, Samsung Electronics under the assigning of the instant application.

I would like to thank you, your Honors, for today's hearing giving me a chance to present our arguments. I'm going to try and narrow the issue down to something very simple today and, if it may please the Court, I would like to begin by possibly a brief introduction of the claimed invention and how I believe it distinguishes, in general, over the prior art.

The instant invention relates to a handoff processing in a short range wireless communication system, for example, and only by way of example, a Bluetooth system or network.

A handoff refers to a process by which a terminal, such as a mobile terminal or a mobile device, which is connected to a network via an access point moves from the wireless range of that access point -- we will call it the first access

1 point -- to a range -- wireless range of the second access point and it's -- the  
2 handoff processing is the changing of the link that in normal devices is  
3 interconnected, interlinked with the first access point, and when it goes to the  
4 range of the second access point, changes its connection and links up with the  
5 second access point.

6 Now, generally speaking, such handoffs in a short-range wireless  
7 communication system are referred to as hard handoffs where, before  
8 establishing this -- the new link with the second access point, the mobile  
9 terminal -- the terminal disconnects, breaks its connection, with the first access  
10 point, so there is going to be a period of time where the mobile terminal is not  
11 connected to any access point.

12 Now, the problem that presents is that during this period of time, obviously,  
13 the mobile terminal cannot exchange data with the network vis-a-vis any  
14 access point.

15 So, for example, downstream data, that's data that's been received by the  
16 terminal, that may be routed to the access point -- to the first access point to be  
17 transmitted to the mobile terminal if the mobile terminal at this point is already  
18 disconnected from the first access point and, therefore, that data is lost.

19 Now, this problem is particularly pronounced in environments in which the  
20 wireless conditions are poor, such as that period of time where the mobile  
21 terminal is connected is prolonged and, therefore, more data is potentially lost.

22 So, accordingly, our claimed invention proposes to solve this problem by,  
23 simply stated, by buffering data that's exchanged with the external device.

24 For example, that old access point, when it receives data to be transmitted to,  
25 to be exchanged with, the network or the mobile terminal buffers that data  
26 such that if -- such that when the handoff processing is completed, that old

1 access point, for example, forwards that buffered data to the new access point  
2 so that if any data is not transmitted to the mobile terminal, the new access  
3 point is received -- is the recipient of that data and subsequently forwards that.  
4 And I apologize. Stop me if you have any questions at any time.  
5 As a result, there is no data lost since any they had not transmitted to the  
6 external device or the terminal is forwarded to the new access point which is at  
7 this point interlinked with the external device.

8 So, for example, the independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, a short-range  
9 wireless communication system comprising the host controller interface  
10 provided with the handoff buffer for buffering data and for exchanging said  
11 data with the external device and a micro-controller for forwarding to a new  
12 access point said buffered data.

13 And I want to sort of highlight this next portion. If a message indicating set of  
14 completion of a connection with the external device is transmitted from the  
15 new access point after a handoff occurs as the external device moves in a state  
16 where the new access point is interlinked with the external device.

17 So, in other words, incident claim 1 recites a micro-controller performing data  
18 forwarding in response to a message transmitted by the new access point  
19 indicating a handoff completion.

20 So I would like to propose here that the issue in this case at this point is very  
21 simple and that is whether a new access point in the cited reference --  
22 references -- sorry -- transmits a message to an old access point indicating that  
23 a handoff has been completed. And it is our -- in fact, it is our contention that  
24 neither of the references Martini or Mitts, either alone or in combination,  
25 suggest a message indicating set of completion of a connection with an  
26 external device is transmitted from a new access point after a handoff occurs,

1 let alone forwarding buffered data if such a message is transmitted from the  
2 new access point.

3 Now, if I can quickly go over Martini or just dismiss Martini since Martini is  
4 not relied upon by the Examiner for a teaching of this feature and, in fact, a  
5 review of Martini will indicate that there is no suggestion of forwarding  
6 buffered data that's exchanged with the mobile terminal or from one access  
7 point to another access point but only in response to such a message that  
8 indicates a handoff completion.

9 So the Examiner relies on Mitts for a teaching of this limitation. Now, Mitts,  
10 at figure 5, discloses, you know, an old base station -- I refer to it as an old  
11 base station -- indicated by reference numeral 40 and a new base station  
12 indicated by reference numeral 50.

13 Now, in this disclosed system, a mobile station, reference numeral 41, when it  
14 moves from the wireless area of the first base station to the second base station  
15 and, therefore, a handoff is performed from the first base station to the second  
16 base station. In this disclosed system, the old base station buffers data to be  
17 exchanged with the mobile station and forwards this buffered data to the new  
18 base station.

19 So, you know, there are some features in this reference -- there are some --  
20 there is some disclosure in this reference that may be relevant to our claim;  
21 however -- well, let me go back for a second and specify the exact process  
22 that's performed.

23 Now, "The old base station forwards this data to the new base station" -- and  
24 I'm quoting from column 8, lines 26 to 28, which is cited by the Examiner in  
25 the -- throughout both Office Actions and his Reply Brief -- "as a response to a  
26 last message, the last message being transmitted from the mobile device, not

1 from the new base station. As a response to the last message and to the  
2 signaling data on the handover that indicate the new base station, the old base  
3 station transmits to the new base station the cells that were in the  
4 first-in/first-out buffer."

5 Now, the Examiner obviously does not cite the last message for a teaching of  
6 our message -- of our claimed message, since the last message is not forwarded  
7 from the -- new access point -- is not transmitted from the new access point  
8 and since that last message does not indicate that a handover has been  
9 completed. Rather, the Examiner cites the signaling.

10 Now, the signaling, I'm going to quote it again, "signaling data on the  
11 handover that indicates the new base station." Now, there is no suggestion, no  
12 disclosure, in Mitts here or elsewhere that states that the signaling data is, A,  
13 indicates that handover has been completed or, B, is even transmitted after the  
14 handover has been completed. In fact, it is totally -- it is completely possible  
15 that -- it is within the realm of possibilities that that message, that signaling,  
16 could take place at any point during, before or after the handover processing.  
17 It does not necessarily have to take place before the -- before the -- after the  
18 handover is completed and to indicate the handover has been completed.

19 Rather, it is just for -- serves one purpose and that's to indicate the new access  
20 point such that the old access point knows where to forward its data. Now --

21 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Counselor --

22 JUDGE NAPPI: Doesn't it say, "on the handover"?

23 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Go ahead. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

24 JUDGE NAPPI: Doesn't it say, "on the handover -- to signaling on the  
25 handover"?

26 MR. KIBLAWI: Yeah -- well, I'm not --

1 JUDGE NAPPI: Doesn't that go against what you were just saying as far as --

2 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, no, not --sorry.

3 JUDGE NAPPI: -- not being before the handover?

4 MR. KIBLAWI: I'm not -- I'm not contending that it is not on the handover.

5 Definitely -- the information is definitely about the handover, it is on the

6 handover. But my point is that it does not necessitate that that message has

7 taken place that is transmitted after the handover is completed, nor is it -- does

8 it specify -- nor does it necessitate, and inherency requires necessity, because

9 there is no explicit disclosure for the Examiner to -- to the extent that he relies

10 on an inherent disclosure, requires necessity, and that it does not necessarily

11 follow from this disclosure that this message indicates that the handover has

12 been completed. Rather -- sorry.

13 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: So if you look at the sentence before that --

14 MR. KIBLAWI: Yes.

15 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: -- "a handover is effected after this where

16 the mobile unit sends to the base station a last message that describes the last

17 successfully received and forwarded cells."

18 MR. KIBLAWI: Okay.

19 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: So, therefore, the mobile is not

20 disconnected. It says I have received this and now we are moving on. So --

21 MR. KIBLAWI: Yeah, you are making my argument for me.

22 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: But why isn't that finished of the connection

23 start of a new connection? It's already been done.

24 MR. KIBLAWI: Yeah.



1 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: So, therefore, we are moving on and the  
2 handover has now taken place and now we are going to transmit whatever is in  
3 the buffer.

4 MR. KIBLAWI: Right. Well, if I may respond, to begin with, there is no  
5 temporal relationship provided in terms of when the last message is sent in  
6 relation to when the signaling is sent.

7 So, for example, last message is sent clearly before the handover is completed  
8 because it is sent from the mobile unit to the old access point. So that's before  
9 the handover has been completed. Now, as I described before, just because  
10 that mobile device disconnects from the old access point does not mean that  
11 the handover has been completed.

12 As I mentioned before, there is that lag time where it is not connected to the  
13 new -- to the new access point as of yet.

14 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: But it has to connect to the new access point  
15 before it can receive the information from the buffer.

16 MR. KIBLAWI: Well -- I'm sorry. What this -- what this reference is stating  
17 is that the old base station receives that last message.

18 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Right. Exactly. But then it has to connect  
19 to the new access point in order to receive whatever has been buffered.

20 MR. KIBLAWI: Yes -- well, the old base station has to connect to the new  
21 base station. And you are right. I'm sorry. I understand what you are saying  
22 now. You are correct --

23 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Right.

24 MR. KIBLAWI: -- that it has to connect.

25 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: So, necessarily --

26 MR. KIBLAWI: That's the handover process. I'm not denying that.

1 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: So, necessarily, the handover has to have  
2 taken place before you receive the buffer data. Otherwise, what's the point?

3 MR. KIBLAWI: I see what you are saying. I see what you are saying. Well,  
4 okay. I guess I have interpreted this a little bit differently.

5 The way I interpreted it as one possible way this could take place is that the  
6 last message could be sent before the handover process is complete. You seem  
7 to be stating that the last message seems to be sent after the handover is  
8 completed.

9 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Right.

10 MR. KIBLAWI: I just don't see that from this disclosure. I think it is within  
11 the realm of possibility -- in fact, the disclosure itself describes that before the  
12 handover is completed, it disconnects -- sorry -- before the mobile device  
13 connects to the new terminal, it disconnects from the old terminal. Therein  
14 lies the problem, the problem being solved by forwarding the data.

15 So if -- by its own disclosure, it provides as a possibility that before the  
16 handover is completed, the mobile device disconnects from the -- from the old  
17 access point or the old base station, which is the whole purpose of buffering  
18 the data. If the mobile -- if the mobile device was still connected to the old  
19 base station while -- after the handover has been completed, after it's  
20 completed connection with new base station, there would be no purpose to  
21 forward the buffered data because it can just get it from the old base station.

22 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Right, right, right. So it has disconnected.

23 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, after it receives the last message, it disconnects from  
24 the old base station because it receives the last message from the -- the old  
25 base station receives the last message from the mobile device; therefore,

1 necessarily, it is still connected to the old -- the mobile device and the old base  
2 station are still connected.

3 JUDGE NAPPI: I just had one other response to what you are saying before,  
4 that this doesn't necessarily inherently -- that's not required for this rejection.  
5 This is a 103 rejection. So, in going back to specific language here, it says,  
6 "and to the signaling on the handover." Even if that doesn't necessarily require  
7 that handover has been completed, doesn't that suggest the handover is  
8 completed, especially given what my colleague was just describing as far as  
9 you need to have closed out with the first base station.

10 MR. KIBLAWI: Okay. Well, if the Examiner is positing that -- that from this  
11 disclosure it is obvious that that -- that that's data on the handover --

12 JUDGE NAPPI: We do have a 103 rejection. Am I off base on that? I  
13 sometimes screw things up with the computer.

14 MR. KIBLAWI: No, it is a 103 rejection.

15 JUDGE NAPPI: Okay.

16 MR. KIBLAWI: There are two references. But I suppose my point would be  
17 that he has not made that statement before, that just because -- you know, just  
18 because this falls in the rubric of an obviousness rejection does not -- he hasn't  
19 cited this specific portion as a -- as a source for, you know, an obvious  
20 disclosure of that data being data indicating that the handover has been  
21 completed, thus, it would be our position that that would be a new ground of  
22 rejection.

23 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: He cited this portion.

24 MR. KIBLAWI: For its explicit disclosure. He stated -- well, if I may -- if I  
25 may state, in the final office action at page 3, he actually argues inherency. He  
26 explicitly discloses inherency. So our response based on his argument was on

1 inherency at this portion right here. And that actually leads me to the main  
2 argument I want to focus on, which is not -- the signaling data, it is our  
3 position, isn't -- doesn't only fail to anticipate message indicating completion  
4 of a set, but our claim also necessitates that that message is transmitted from  
5 the new base station to the old base station; okay?

6 Now, there is nowhere -- no suggestion in here that the old -- the new base  
7 station transmits the signaling data to the old base station, and it is our reliance  
8 on the Examiner's rejection where he bases his rejection on inherency on page  
9 3 of the Office Action, he states that it is inherent that that the new base station  
10 transmits that signaling to the old base station.

11 So I want to contest that point, if I may, may it please the --

12 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: And what about your prior art? That's  
13 admitted prior art that you have to get -- I mean you admit in your disclosure  
14 that you get an acknowledgment before the handover; right?

15 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, I can't speak to that as of yet because that would be --  
16 that would also be a new ground of rejection. He hasn't cited our prior --

17 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: But you admit that that's how it's done;  
18 right? I mean that is how it is done.

19 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, in -- in our disclosure, which is --

20 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: No. No. In the prior art. In the prior art.  
21 Figure 1.

22 MR. KIBLAWI: Okay. And you are talking -- you are referring to our  
23 specification figure 1.

24 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Figure 1.

25 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, you know, if I had the opportunity to respond to such a  
26 rejection citing our art against us or citing -- not our art, citing what you --

1 what allegedly is our -- applicant admitted prior art, then I would respond in  
2 kind, but he hasn't made that rejection such that it would be a new ground of  
3 rejection. For example --

4 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: But what I am saying is not new. It is  
5 acknowledgment signal. This is not new, this is conventional, that you get this  
6 acknowledgement signal.

7 MR. KIBLAWI: But the Examiner hasn't --

8 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: But what is new is that what your invention  
9 has is this buffer, right, that receives this acknowledgment signal?

10 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, what's new is that in response to a message indicating  
11 the handover has been completed, and that's very important in this -- in our  
12 claim, being received from the new access point, the data is forwarded. That's  
13 not in our Applicant admitted prior art. It's not. And if the Examiner wants to  
14 cite that, that would be a new ground of rejection and at which point we can  
15 respond.

16 JUDGE NAPPI: You know we have the authority to write new grounds of  
17 rejection so I would think it would be nice if you could explain to us why that  
18 rationale wouldn't apply, protect -- maybe to save us from making an  
19 imprudent new grounds of rejection.

20 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, I definitely understand that and if I may suggest, to be  
21 quite honest, I hadn't thought of that and we hadn't received that rejection. If I  
22 may perhaps submit a Supplemental Brief in the next -- by the end of the week  
23 for your consideration on that point, I can address a potential rejection citing  
24 our alleged Applicant admitted prior art.

1 JUDGE NAPPI: No, we haven't made the rejection yet so it would be -- if we  
2 made the new grounds of rejection, you would have the opportunity to respond  
3 in a request --

4 MR. KIBLAWI: I would appreciate that. Thank you.

5 JUDGE NAPPI: Yeah. But, you know, a lot of times we ask the questions  
6 because we want to understand the art better and -- you know, your disclosure  
7 has admitted that this is conventional and we wanted -- we are faced with the  
8 situation we have a disclosure that admits something is conventional and then  
9 we have an argument that this same feature is something that is novel and we  
10 have problems reconciling those two and that's why we are asking the  
11 questions.

12 MR. KIBLAWI: Yes, I understand that and I appreciate that. And I suppose  
13 that, another, you know, argument I would like to forward here is that in that  
14 reference Mitts, they proposal in their own -- in their own art, in their own  
15 admitted art, in their own admitted prior art -- I apologize -- that they also have  
16 a system whereby a message -- a mobile representative -- I don't want to  
17 misstate the term. I believe they refer to it as a mobile representative, MR.  
18 I'm referring to fig 2 of Mitts.

19 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: Yeah, I mean I read the arguments  
20 regarding that and I mean that's not the point. The point is it is column 8 that  
21 the Examiner is pointing to.

22 MR. KIBLAWI: Yes.

23 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: I mean I read -- we all read the Brief and we  
24 understand what you are saying with respect to that. Yes, that doesn't point to  
25 what your invention is. But with respect to column 8, I think it is a different  
26 story because it seems like it says exactly what you are claiming and we

1 don't -- we don't see the distinction because, you know, what else could the  
2 signaling be other than the handover is complete, now send over whatever has  
3 been buffered.

4 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, if I may --

5 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: I mean what else could the signaling be?  
6 Can you tell us?

7 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, okay, the signaling could just indicate the address or  
8 the identity of the new access point. That's all that that old access point needs.

9 JUDGE MANTIS-MERCADER: Why would that be?

10 MR. KIBLAWI: Because the old access point needs to know where it is  
11 forwarding the buffered data. So all it needs -- the only information it needs  
12 and the only thing that's explicitly disclosed is that information is on --  
13 identifies the new access point. It doesn't state that the -- that the handover has  
14 over completed. And, in fact, looking at that method, I don't see any  
15 requirement that the handover has to be completed. In fact, the last message --  
16 the last message is sent from the mobile unit before the handover is completed  
17 for the reasons stated prior because the mobile unit is still connected to the  
18 old access point. So that message is --

19 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: But it seems to me that the mobile unit is  
20 sending to say that's it, I received -- it says I described the last successfully  
21 received or forwarded cell, the last message. It says I have received all this  
22 information. That's the end of the story. And now I'm sending you a last  
23 message and a signaling data. Now I'm telling you it is all done.

24 Now, you can -- I'm connected now. I'm going to connect to the new access  
25 point and now you send me the FIFO. Why isn't that -- we have completed  
26 now.

1 MR. KIBLAWI: Okay. Let me ask you something, though. Theoretically,  
2 the signaling could be received at the same time as the last data; correct? And  
3 even from the same source. In fact, the Examiner admits that. In his advisory  
4 action, he states, and I'm going to quote him -- he states, "such signaling data  
5 could be sent from . . . the -- or the mobile" -- sorry -- "or the mobile unit  
6 could signal the old base station that it has handoffs from the new base  
7 station."

8 The Examiner himself admits that it could be transmitted from the mobile  
9 station, which goes to my other argument that, you know, while the Examiner  
10 in the Final Office Action argues that it's inherent that the new base station  
11 transmits the signaling, he contradicts his argument of inherency in the  
12 Advisory Action when he proposes a different possibility, i.e., the mobile unit  
13 sending the signaling data, but that's a different point.

14 Let me go back to your answer. Theoretically, the last message and the  
15 signaling data could be sent at the same time. There is nothing in the reference  
16 that necessitates the signaling data being sent after the handover is completed.  
17 There is nothing in the reference that states that and, in fact, it sort of couples  
18 that signaling with that last message, which is necessarily transmitted before  
19 the handover is completed.

20 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: What's the criticality of that? I mean  
21 whether it is completed before or after, who cares? The important thing is that  
22 we have the information from the FIFO that's it's going to be sent now, so who  
23 cares if it is before or after? Under obviousness, what's the significance?

24 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, if we were given that obviousness rejection, you know,  
25 I would like -- as I mentioned earlier, I would like an opportunity to respond to  
26 that but, you know -- I suppose my question would be, in response to a prior



1 art rejection, it is just not there. Whatever the significance may be, you know  
2 -- I don't want to put anything on the record that --

3 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: But I'm saying it is an obviousness rejection  
4 so wouldn't that be an obvious variation -- it could be sent before or after? The  
5 significance is -- is that you get a signal saying send us new information now.

6 MR. KIBLAWI: Well, your Honor, I understand that and, as I mentioned  
7 before, I never thought of that before and, if I could, you know -- so it was not  
8 -- since he was relying on explicit disclosure and then an inherent disclosure, I  
9 didn't assess it from an obviousness perspective.

10 And if he was to make that obviousness rejection, then I would posit at this  
11 point he hasn't met his prima facie burden for an obviousness rejection by  
12 providing the rationale, a rationale for -- for such a modification of the explicit  
13 disclosure of the reference.

14 Now, what I do know is that the Examiner has provided a rejection based on  
15 inherency, as can be seen on page 3 of the Final Office Action, and my point  
16 for this current rejection -- for this current rejection, the state of it is right now,  
17 my point is that while the Examiner states that it's inherent that signaling data  
18 is transmitted from the new handover, that's in the rejection, that's what my job  
19 is to respond to, you know, our point is that the Examiner himself admits that  
20 it is not inherent in the advisory action when he proposes an alternative  
21 method, i.e., the mobile device sending --

22 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: And I would agree with you if it was under  
23 a 102 but it is not; it is under a 103. So just because the Examiner said it is  
24 inherent that that section teaches that, it is still under a 103.

25 MR. KIBLAWI: Okay. Well, if the Examiner -- even though the Examiner  
26 does not state that it is obvious that the signaling data is transmitted from the

1 new station or that the signaling data is -- indicates that the handover has been  
2 completed, I would posit at this point that the -- that the Examiner has not  
3 established a prima facie obviousness rejection because he has not provided us  
4 the rationale for modifying the explicit disclosure of the reference to what you  
5 suggest may be an obvious modification, and because he has not provided that  
6 rationale, he hasn't met his burden.

7 And by him not meeting his burden, what am I to do? You know, I can't  
8 respond to potential rejections, I can only respond to rejections that are on the  
9 table; correct?

10 So, the rejection on the table -- and, again, I apologize for not being able to  
11 answer your questions fully -- is an inherency rejection and I would like to -- I  
12 would like to, you know, request your Honors', you know, patience with me  
13 right now in making that inherency argument.

14 But in terms of -- in terms of the obviousness of it, you know, you are trying  
15 To argue -- you are trying to ask me why is it significant and when I have  
16 that rejection, I would be able -- I would be able to fully respond. At this  
17 point I don't want to put anything on the record that might not be fully  
18 accurate.

19 JUDGE NAPPI: Any further questions?

20 JUDGE BAUMEISTER: I'm good.

21 JUDGE NAPPI: Thank you very much for your time.

22 MR. KIBLAWI: Thank you for this opportunity. My first time and I feel like  
23 you guys were a little easy on me.

24 JUDGE MANTIS MERCADER: You can stay longer if you like.

25 MR. KIBLAWI: I have 20 minutes; right?

26 JUDGE NAPPI: You went over but that's fine.

1 MR. KIBLAWI: Oh, I did? That's what that light means.

2 JUDGE NAPPI: Yeah.

3 Whereupon, the proceedings at 10:18 a.m. were concluded.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13